


Under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a valid OMB control number.

PRE-APPEAL BRIEF REQUEST FOR REVIEW		Docket Number (Optional) KRAMER 2-1-3	
<p>I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to "Mail Stop AF, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450" [37 CFR 1.8(a)] on <u>June 23, 2008</u></p> <p>Signature <u>/Karen Vertz/</u></p> <p>Typed or printed name <u>Karen Vertz</u></p>		Application Number 10/044,185	Filed January 9, 2002
		First Named Inventor David B. Kramer	
		Art Unit 2616	Examiner Jason E. Mattis
<p>Applicant requests review of the final rejection in the above-identified application. No amendments are being filed with this request.</p> <p>This request is being filed with a notice of appeal.</p> <p>The review is requested for the reason(s) stated on the attached sheet(s). Note: No more than five (5) pages may be provided.</p> <div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-between; align-items: flex-start; margin-top: 20px;"><div style="width: 45%;"><p>I am the</p><p><input type="checkbox"/> applicant/inventor.</p><p><input type="checkbox"/> assignee of record of the entire interest. See 37 CFR 3.71. Statement under 37 CFR 3.73(b) is enclosed. (Form PTO/SB/96)</p><p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> attorney or agent of record. 33,182 Registration number _____</p><p><input type="checkbox"/> attorney or agent acting under 37 CFR 1.34. Registration number if acting under 37 CFR 1.34 _____</p></div><div style="width: 50%; text-align: center;"> _____ Signature David H. Hitt _____ Typed or printed name 972-480-8800 _____ Telephone number June 23, 2008 _____ Date</div></div> <p style="margin-top: 20px;">NOTE: Signatures of all the inventors or assignees of record of the entire interest or their representative(s) are required. Submit multiple forms if more than one signature is required, see below*.</p>			
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> *Total of <u>1</u> forms are submitted.</p>			

This collection of information is required by 35 U.S.C. 132. The information is required to obtain or retain a benefit by the public which is to file (and by the USPTO to process) an application. Confidentiality is governed by 35 U.S.C. 122 and 37 CFR 1.11, 1.14 and 41.6. This collection is estimated to take 12 minutes to complete, including gathering, preparing, and submitting the completed application form to the USPTO. Time will vary depending upon the individual case. Any comments on the amount of time you require to complete this form and/or suggestions for reducing this burden, should be sent to the Chief Information Officer, U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, U.S. Department of Commerce, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450. DO NOT SEND FEES OR COMPLETED FORMS TO THIS ADDRESS. SEND TO: Mail Stop AF, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

If you need assistance in completing the form, call 1-800-PTO-9199 and select option 2.

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Applicant: David B. Kramer, *et al.*

Serial No.: 10/044,185

Filed: January 9, 2002

Title: NON-BLOCKING CROSSBAR AND METHOD OF OPERATION
THEREOF

Grp./A.U.: 2616

Examiner: Jason E. Mattis

Confirmation No.: 9779

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being electronically filed
with United States Patent and trademark Office on:

June 23, 2008 (Date)

Karen Vertz

(Printed or typed name of person signing the certificate)

/Karen Vertz/

(Signature of the person signing the certificate)

Sir:

PRE-APPEAL BRIEF REQUEST FOR REVIEW

The Applicants have carefully considered this Application in connection with the Examiner's Final Rejection mailed May 7, 2008, and the Advisory Action of June 9, 2008, and respectfully request a Pre-Appeal Brief Review of this Application in view of the following remarks.

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The Applicants originally submitted Claims 1-20 in the Application. Accordingly, Claims 1-20 are currently pending in the Application.

I. Rejection of Claims 1-20 under 35 U.S.C. §103

The Examiner has rejected Claims 1-3, 6-10, 13 and 14 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being anticipated by U.S. Publication No. 2002/0110086 to Reches ("Reches") in view of U.S. Patent Publication 2002/0087778 to Dell *et al.* ("Dell".) The Examiner has rejected the remaining dependent claims under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being variously anticipated by Reches in view of Dell and in further view of U.S. Patent No. 6,975,638 to Chen *et al.* ("Chen") and U.S. Patent No. 5,905,873 to Hartmann *et al.* ("Hartmann"). The Applicants respectfully disagree in light of the following remarks, and request the claims be allowed to issue.

The Examiner has previously recognized that Reche does not disclose "causing packets to be transmitted only when a destination FIFO and in interposing one of the crossbar FIFOs have sufficient memory at the same time to receive and then contain an entirety of [*sic.* "a packet of"] the packets." (See Examiner's Final Action, page 3)

The Examiner cited to Dell to cure this deficiency. The Examiner contended:

See pages 8-9 paragraphs 111-120, pages 9-10 paragraphs 128-137, and Figures 12 and 15-16 of Dell *et al.* for reference to input devices receiving grants to transmit cells only when there is no back-pressure in corresponding FIFO queues that make up a path from an input to the destination meaning that a cell is transmitted toward the output only when all queues have enough memory to contain the cell at the same time. (See Examiner's Final Action, pages 3-4.)

Dell is generally directed a switching stage that employs crossbar devices. (See page 2, paragraph [0013]). In Dell, the "switch fabric of the present invention is a cell-switching engine handling *fixed-sized* switching cells." (See page 6, paragraph [0090]). Dell uses one or more crossbars to achieve scalability in self-routing of cells. (See page 2, paragraph [0012]). In Dell, "[a] switching cell has a header and a payload. The payload size is programmable... The term 'programmable' implies that ... the particular payload size is selected when the fabric switch is initially configured. Once the switch fabric is configured, the payload size remains fixed for all subsequent switch fabric operations." (See page 6, paragraph [0090]; emphasis added).

In paragraph [0091], Dell states:

Protocol independence is achieved by *encapsulating user data packets into the payload of switching cells*. This encapsulation function is provided by network processors on the line cards. When user data packets are larger than the switching cell size, the encapsulation function involves dividing each user data packet into two or more different switching cells.

(Emphasis added.)

In other words, Dell *encapsulates* data packets into the payload of switching *cells*. The Applicants respectfully state that the cited portions of Dell do not disclose or suggest wherein the cells “plurality of packets that are unencapsulated, unsegmented and of differing lengths,” as are also claimed in Claim 1.

According to M.P.E.P. §2146.2: “References Cannot Be Combined Where Reference Teaches Away From Their Combination.” There is an explicit “teaching away” from a use of segmentation of packets, such as found in the secondary reference of Dell, within the primary reference of Reche.

Reche states:

[0004-0005] Both Aybay and McKeown illustrate crossbar switches that use a synchronous scheduling scheme and handle fixed length cells. Variable length packets are fragmented to a plurality of fixed length cells before being sent across the crossbar switch to be reassembled to generate variable length packets. At each time slot a plurality of fixed size cells are sent across the crossbar switch... A main disadvantage of these crossbar switches is that the segmentation and the reassembly are both time and resource consuming. Furthermore, the addition of control signals for allowing the segmentation and reassembly of the variable length packet reduce the throughput of the crossbar switch. (Emphasis added)

Indeed, the “Field of the Invention” of Reches states:

[0001] The present invention relates to a multiport switch and a method for forwarding variable length packets across a multiport switch and especially for a method for forwarding variable length packets *without segmenting the variable length packets to fixed sized cells* within a network element having a multiport switch. (Emphasis added.)

Furthermore, the “Summary of the Invention” of Reches states:

[0008] The invention provides a method for forwarding variable length packets across a multiport switch. *The method does not require to segment or to fragment a received variable length packet thus reducing overhead and allowing an enhanced throughput of the crossbar.* The method is based upon a periodic scheduling scheme that simplifies the scheduling.

The above constitutes an explicit teaching away from the fixed-cell segmentation approach of Dell. Dell is therefore an inapposite reference, and is not properly combinable with Reche, and the Examiner has not made a proper *prima facie* case of obviousness.

However, the Examiner erroneously contends that the above arguments regarding Reche “teaching away” from packet segmentation, such as used in Dell, are moot. The Examiner states in the Advisory Action of June 6, 2008:

Applicant also argues that because Dell et al discloses using fixed-size switching cells, Dell

et al teaches away from the method disclosed by Reches; however this argument is also moot since the combination used in the rejections under 35 U.S.C. 103 does not involve combining the cells used by Dell et al with the system and method of Reches. The combination used in the prior art rejection is based on a combination of the Dell et al. teaching of only allowing input devices to transmit data through a switch to an output when there is no back-pressure in any switch stage between the input and the output ... with the system and method of Reches. Thus it is not the cell structure of Dell et al. that is combined with the system and method of Reches, but rather the forwarding grant determining method of Dell et al. that is combined with the system and method of Reches. (*See* Advisory Action, pages 2-3.)

The Applicants respectfully state that the Examiner has not applied a correct legal standard as to what constitutes a “teaching away.” Therefore, the Examiner’s conclusion regarding the above arguments regarding the “teaching away” made by the Applicants as “moot” is in error. According to the M.P.E.P. §2143.03 VI: “A prior art reference must be considered in its entirety, i.e., as a whole, including portions that would lead away from the claimed invention. *W.L. Gore & Associates, Inc. v Garlock, Inc.*, 721 F.2d 1540, 220 USPQ 303 (Fed. Cir. 1983), *cert. denied*, 469 U.S. 851 (1984).” (Emphasis in M.P.E.P.) When “mooting” the above-noted arguments concerning the explicit “teaching away” regarding packet segmentation of Reches by only combining Reches with a “specific teaching” of Dell, rather than considering Dell “as a whole” as required by case-law and M.P.E.P. §2143.03 VI, the Examiner erroneously ignores the “as a whole” requirement. Therefore, the Examiner has not presented a proper *prima facie* case of obviousness.

Indeed, the above “teaching away” of Reche from packet segmentation is not surprising. According to the M.P.E.P. §2143.02 VI: “The Proposed Modification Cannot Change the Principle or Operation of a Reference,” which the Examiner would improperly do if allowed to combine the two references. If, *arguendo*, the back-pressure grant determination of Dell as characterized by the Examiner were to be used in the variable packet environment of Reche as improperly proposed by the Examiner, Dell would not check FIFOs, whether they be destination FIFOs or crossbar FIFOs, to determine whether they have sufficient memory to contain an *entire* packet, as Claim 1 recites.

To the contrary, in Dell, if any space in memory of the back-pressure grant determination is available, it is deemed sufficient. The actual amount of memory available to contain a cell is not checked. Dell has no need to check the amount of memory, as programmed cell length does not vary. Moreover, Reches would have to employ a back pressure grant determination system designed for fixed-length cells, which would not determine whether a destination FIFO and a crossbar FIFO have sufficient memory to contain an *entire* packet, as Claim 1 recites.

Furthermore, Reche states: “Another prior art solution for scheduling variable sized packets is to constantly track the outputs and the inputs in order to determine when variable length packets

finished to traverse the crossbar switch. This method complicated the scheduling scheme and is not fitted to ultra high frequency switching.” (See paragraph [0006]). In light of this teaching away, one of ordinary skill in the art would not be motivated to combine Reches, which disparages continuously tracking outputs and inputs, with Dell, which the Examiner cites for a disclosure of a “forwarding grant determining method”, to arrive at the invention of independent Claim 1, which recites. “a scheduler configured to cause a plurality of packets that are unencapsulated, unsegmented and of differing lengths to be transmitted ... only when both said destination FIFO associated therewith and an interposing one of said crossbar FIFOs have sufficient memory at a same time to receive, and then contain an entirety of a packet of said plurality of packets.” Instead, Reches employs a periodic scheduling, which helps avoid a need for constantly tracking inputs and outputs.

In light of the foregoing arguments, the Examiner has therefore not presented a proper *prima facie* case of obviousness. The Applicants therefore respectfully state that the Examiner has not therefore presented a *prima facie* case of obviousness for independent Claim 1, nor for similar reasons, independent Claims 8 and 15, nor their respective dependent claims. Nor has the Examiner cited Chen and Hartmann to cure this deficiency.

II. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing remarks, the Applicant sees all of the Claims currently pending in this Application to be in condition for allowance and therefore earnestly solicits a Notice of Allowance for Claims 1-20.

The Applicant requests the Reviewers to telephone the undersigned attorney of record at (972) 480-8800 if such would further or expedite the prosecution of the present Application. The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees, credits or overpayments to Deposit Account 08-2395.

Respectfully submitted,

HITT GAINES, PC

David H. Hitt

Registration No. 33,182

Dated: June 23, 2008
P.O. Box 832570
Richardson, Texas 75083
(972) 480-8800